Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/691,645	MAURER ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	David L. Sorkin	1723	·
All Participants:	Status of Application	:	
(1) <u>David L. Sorkin</u> .	(3)		·
(2) Wiliam Michael Hynes.	(4)		
Date of Interview: 2 February 2004	Time: <u>12:30 PM</u>		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Appli Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:	icant's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: not discussed			
Claims discussed: 9-19, especially 11-13			
Prior art documents discussed: not discussed			
Part II.			
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GEN See Continuation Sheet	NERAL NATURE OF WHAT	WAS DISCUSSED:	
Part III.	•		
 ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summ 	The examiner will provide a e record of the substance of	written summary of t of the interview, since	he substance
	·		,
Day late		3	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (Application	ant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if appr	ropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Mr. Hynes authorized an examiner's amendment canceling the non-elected claims and eliminating the requirement that the protrusion be "supported on" a "continuous entirely planar, circumferential joint surface", which the examiner contended was not sufficiently supported in the originally filed specification, particularly in combination with the other requirements of claim 13...